



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,563	03/25/2004	Donald J. Yantzi	CA920030040US1	7948
45502 7590 12/28/2007 DILLON & YUDELL LLP 8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY., SUITE 2110 AUSTIN, TX 78759			EXAMINER POLTORAK, PIOTR	
			ART UNIT 2134	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,563

Applicant(s)

YANTZI, DONALD J.

Examiner

Peter Poltorak

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5 and 26-30 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments and amendments addressed the objections to claims and drawings as well as the 35 USC § 101 and 112, second paragraph rejections which, as a result, are withdrawn.
3. As per art rejection, applicant arguments are essentially directed towards the newly introduced limitations. These limitations (and arguments) are addressed in this Office Action, below.
4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claims 1-5 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly amended claim language introduces the term: "front-end interfaces" that is not present in the original specification. The specification discloses terms such as "an interface process", "a user interface", "a front-end process", "a front-end client", each of the terms not necessarily being equivalent. More importantly, the original specification does not recite "passing said retrieved password from said password registry to said

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5 and 26-30 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments and amendments addressed the objections to claims and drawings as well as the 35 USC § 101 and 112, second paragraph rejections which, as a result, are withdrawn.
3. As per art rejection, applicant arguments are essentially directed towards the newly introduced limitations. These limitations (and arguments) are addressed in this Office Action, below.
4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-5 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly amended claim language introduces the term: "front-end interfaces" that is not present in the original specification. The specification discloses terms such as "an interface

process", "a user interface", "a front-end process", "a front-end client", each of the terms not necessarily being equivalent. More importantly, the original specification does not recite "passing said retrieved password from said password registry to said corresponding front-end interface ..." as cited in the amended claim 1 and newly added claim 26.

6. Claims 1-5 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. As mentioned above, the original specification does not offer the clear definition of "front-end interfaces" and multiple interpretations could read on the claimed limitations. For purpose of the further examination the term "front-end interface" is treated broadly as meaning a module/process or set of processes that is associated with a password and a resource.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 1-5 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kao (USPUB 2002/0122553) in view of Wu (USPN 5774551) or alternatively in view of Honeyman (Peter Honeyman, "Pluggable Authentication Modules for Windows NT", Proceedings of the 2nd USENIX Windows NT Symposium Seattle, Washington, Aug. 3-4, 1998).

As per claim 1, Kao discloses managing a user's password for a plurality of resource using a password registry associated with the user (e.g. Kao, Fig. 3A and [38]), the encrypted password for each of a type of system resource (Kao, [4], [32], [38] and

Fig. 3A-B, for example), generating encrypted passwords for the resources from encrypting a corresponding unencrypted user specified password associated with the resource (Kao, [49-50]), passing a retrieved password from the password registry for decryption in order to permit an access request (Kao, [51]).

8. Kao does not explicitly disclose front-end interfaces provided at the workstation and corresponding to types of system resources, and utilizing user credentials (e.g. the decrypted password is passed), in order to permit the access request. However, employing front-end interfaces corresponding to type of systems at a workstation, and utilizing user credentials (such as decrypted passwords) in order to permit access request are old and well known in the art of computing, as illustrated by Wu (USPN, Fig. 1 and 3, and associated text) or alternatively Honeyman (Fig. 3.5 and 4.2, and associated text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include such front-end interfaces given the benefit of flexibility and scalability.
9. Although Kao discloses that "the user's target password is accepted" [49]", Kao does not explicitly disclose that the password is provided by the user. However, providing passwords is old and well known in the art of computer security, and it would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan to extend Kao's invention to include passwords provided by users given the benefit of usability.
10. As per claim 2-3, Kao discloses associating each of the encrypted passwords with at least one of a user ID, a resource hostname, and a resource type (Kao, Fig. 3B, [43], etc.).

Art Unit: 2134

11. As per claims 4-5, Kao discloses retrieving a user-specified password from a registry, which inherently utilize a query key (retrieving a variable from a registry (database) requires a query key as also seen in Fig.4 and associated text), However, Kao is silent regarding at least one of said user ID, and resource hostname, and said resource type as a query key to uniquely identify. However, the limitation, if not inherent is at least obvious. An ordinary artisan would appreciate that in order to query a database (registry), a unique query key must be used, and utilizing a user identification as a query would have been at least an obvious variation that is old and well known in the art (e.g. Windows NT). One would have been motivated to use them especially in light of the benefits of this implementation as evidenced by their commercial success.
12. Claims 26-30 are substantially similar to claims 1-5; thus, claims 26-30 are similarly rejected.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Jones (USPN 5655077),
Larson (USPUB 2002/0095395),
Charisius (USPUB 2002/0107914).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2134

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Poltorak whose telephone number is (571) 272-3840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pat
12/21/07

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

[Signature]
12, 21, 07